



Socialist Call

VOL. XIX—No. 22—Total 786

NEW YORK, N. Y., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1952

PRICE FIVE CENTS

VOTE SOCIALIST!

Darlington

HOOPEs

for

President



Samuel H.

FRIEDMAN

for

Vice-Pres.

Vote For Socialist Candidates In These States

(Write In The Names Of Socialist Candidates HOOPEs And FRIEDMAN In Other States)

Colorado

Maine

Vermont

Connecticut

Missouri

Virginia

Delaware

Montana

Washington

Iowa

New Jersey

Wisconsin

Kansas

New York

Wyoming

Pennsylvania

(See Page Eight For A Full Listing Of State Candidates Of The Socialist Party)

What Is Democratic Socialism?

By DARLINGTON HOOPES
(Socialist Candidate for President)

One of the most dangerous trends in this country today is the growing fear of their own government which businessmen are instilling into the minds of the people. The wealthy have long used the powers of government to enrich themselves, as witness the protective tariffs, the government subsidies to ocean, railroad and airlines, and the depreciation allowances for the construction of defense plants, to mention only a few.

Now that the Labor Party in Great Britain has proven that the powers of government can also be used to distribute the national income more fairly among all the people, American big-businessmen are afraid that you may get the same idea. They know that that would mean the end of their special privileges, so they are putting on a scare campaign. They figure that if they can scare you into believing that government interference in business is a bad thing, and can thereby keep you from using the powers of government to help yourselves, that they can go on using them to enrich themselves as they have for hundreds of years.

In a democracy government is a tool which should be used to advance the common welfare. It should not be used to enrich the few. That is undemocratic and discriminatory. We shouldn't allow such things to happen, and if they do happen, it is our fault. We can stop them whenever we make up our minds to do so. This is where the Socialist Party comes in. It is organized for the purpose of enabling the people to take over the powers of government and use them to build a new society.

Some of you are probably saying, "What do you mean by new society? In what way will it be different from the present?" Let me answer you in the words of Michael Stewart, Labor member of Parliament:

"The Society we desire has four special characteristics. In it, decisions which affect the economic and social life of the community should be made by the **community for the public welfare**, not by **private persons for their own advantage**. Differences of income should not be so large as to split the nation into groups which cannot understand each other's way of life. Incomes for those able to work should be proportionate to the contribution they make and opportunity to improve one's position should be equally open to all. And, finally, the community should make humane provision, according to need, for those who for any reason cannot be expected to work. The purpose of these economic principles, as of all economic activity, is to provide the material basis for the full development, by every individual, of his personality. Personality is developed both by work and by leisure and the education provided by the community should equip the individual for both. The words "every individual" mean exactly what they say: every individual without distinction of color, creed or race."

DEMOCRATIC DECISIONS

Let us for a few minutes talk about some of these decisions which we Socialists say should be made democratically by the people for the public instead of arbitrarily by private individuals for their own profit. Spokesmen for big business shout loudly against government interference in economic affairs. They are frequently quoted as being against any sort of economic planning.

They don't mean that at all. What they mean is that they want to do the planning so as to make **more profit** for themselves. They object to the government stepping in, and planning in the interests of the common people, particularly if it limits their profits, as it almost always does. Of

course, if they get into trouble, they are quick to call upon the government to help them.

Let me illustrate what I mean. According to the Federal Trade Commission reports, in 1947 **one hundred and thirteen** corporations owned **sixteen billion dollars** worth of manufacturing property, plant, and equipment, or forty-six percent of all such property in the United States. In **fifteen** major manufacturing industries **six** or fewer companies own **two-thirds** of all the capital assets. In **seventeen** industries **one** company owns **one-quarter or more** of all such facilities.

In order that you may understand that these are not minor or unimportant industries, let me list a few of them. Steel, aluminum, copper, rubber, glass, meat products, dairy products, cigarettes, distilled liquors, motor vehicles, farm machinery and plumbing equipment.

It would seem that it is bad enough to allow **one hundred and thirteen** corporations to control such a large segment of our economic life, but that is not the worst. (Less than **twenty** large banks and insurance companies control most of those one hundred and thirteen corporations, and dictate the policies of those industries, through their representatives on the boards of directors of those corporations.)

In other words, by determining the wages of their employees those boards of directors are in a position to dictate the sort of life that the families of those employees will live. Do you think that such vast powers over the lives of so many people should be in the hands of the directors of **twenty** large banks and insurance companies, who are responsible solely to the large shareholders of those financial giants?

These boards of directors also have the power to determine the quantity of goods that are to be manufactured in any particular industry. Most of you remember the arguments that were advanced in favor of the removal of price controls back in 1946. Senator Taft and others told us if only we took the controls off private industry, that production would increase so rapidly that prices would come down.

You remember what happened, don't you? The directors of those one hundred and thirteen corporations saw to it that production did not increase fast enough to bring prices down. They restricted production so as to keep it within the limits of demand, with the result that instead of prices coming down, they shot through the roof, and have been up there ever since.

Let me point out in a very realistic way the price that the people of the United States are likely to have to pay for having left the control of the great industries in private hands. What do you think is going to happen if peace should suddenly break out? I have asked that question of a good many people, and the usual answer which I receive, is to the effect that we are going to have such a depression that it will make the last one look like a tea party.

And don't forget that we didn't get out of that last depression until we got into World War II. There were 8 million unemployed in the United States in 1941. Capitalist business has learned how to produce so many goods that unless we have a war, or some other program whereby the government buys a large part of them, they can't find a market for them. When they can't sell goods, they shut down the plants, and we have a depression.

Of course, we Socialists can suggest a way of solving the problem without war or depression, but those private boards of directors will never agree to that. All that is necessary is to increase the wages or cut the prices of goods, or both, to a point where the workers can buy back what they produce. Instead of building airplanes and tanks to kill our fellow men, we could build decent homes for the more than one-half of our

people in this country, and most of the people in the other countries of the world who now live in hovels, slums and substandard dwellings.

We could build new schools and colleges to provide better educational facilities for millions of our boys and girls who are receiving the kind of education which they need at the present time. In this the richest country on the earth a few of our boys and girls are going to school in new modern buildings, but did you ever look around to see how many children in your town or city are going to school in buildings that were built fifty or seventy-five or more years ago, and are not modern in any respect? No one would seriously contend that those old buildings are in any wise equal to the modern ones and they should be replaced immediately.

We need many more hospitals. Most of the present ones are crowded to the doors. We must have more medical schools to train more doctors so that our people will have adequate medical care. We should have more libraries, parks and recreational facilities. We have built very few new public buildings within the last twelve years. We can develop our river valleys by building dams which will prevent floods, and furnish power, irrigation and other advantages.

While I have not pretended to cover the field I think I have suggested enough projects to keep our industries operating at full capacity for quite a few years. What is necessary is for the people to get control of these industries so they may be operated for the use and benefit of everybody instead of for the private profit of the few. And that is the basic economic program of the Socialist Party. That is what we mean when we talk of the co-operative commonwealth.

HELPING ASIAN COUNTRIES

And don't forget that if we are to have world peace on anything like a permanent basis we have to help the peoples of the poverty stricken countries of Asia, Africa and South America raise their living standards to a scale somewhat comparable to our own. They are not going to sit by and peacefully starve to death while we live in great luxury. It is our moral duty to help our fellow humans wherever they live and whatever their race or color. We have reached the point in world history where, if we fail to perform that duty, we are going to be confronted with perpetual revolution and war.

The peoples of the Western world have to make some most important decisions in the very near future. Our forefathers established and bequeathed to us, political democracy. It isn't perfect, but it has within itself the means for improvement, and that is part of our job. We have to go further than that. We must extend democracy to the economic field. We have to have economic democracy. It is most desirable that the people should have the right to elect the President of the United States. In deep sincerity I ask you, isn't it even more important that they have the right to make decisions on such matters as I have been talking about this evening?

Nearly a hundred years have passed since Abraham Lincoln made his famous statement that this nation cannot remain half slave and half free. I submit to you that it cannot remain half democratic and half totalitarian. Either the people are going to use the democratic principles which they have in the political field, to extend democracy to the economic field, or big business is going to take over the government and we are going to have Fascism.

Either the people are going to take over business or big business is going to take over people. Political democracy cannot continue to exist in a country where such vast economic

(Continued on Page 3)

An Election Message To U.S. Workers

By CARLE WHITEHEAD

(Socialist candidate for Congress, First Congressional District, Colorado.)

Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them.

To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government."

—ABRAHAM LINCOLN

I shall take as my text these words from Lincoln because they state the very heart of Socialism. Lincoln also said that useless labor and idleness take a large share of what belongs to the doers of useful work and should be driven out of existence so that all should share in doing the useful work and share in the product.

The Demo-Republican platforms and candidates say nothing like Lincoln's words about labor. On the contrary, those platforms and candidates promise to save the profit system which makes useless work and rich idlers, both of which rob you doers of useful work of a large part of what you produce and which, as Lincoln said, belongs to you.

Listen to what the New York Times says is shown by our 1930 census. The highest paid fifth of our people (including rich idlers and the doers of useless work) receive 47% of the national income and the lowest paid fifth receive only 3%. The highest paid 30 million don't produce sixteen times as much as the lowest paid 30 million. A large part of the coupon clippers, those who live on inherited fortunes, the bankers, money lenders, landlords, promoters, etc., don't produce anything, but the top 30 million, of which they are a part, receive sixteen times as much of the national income as you doers of useful, productive work who are in the lowest paid 30 million.

Worse than that, the proportion of the national income that goes to the lowest paid 30 million is growing less even under the Democrats. In the bottom of the depression of the thirties (before the New Deal) you lowest paid 30 million got 4% of the national income. Now you get only 3%. Just one quarter less than you got under Republicans and depression.

You are employed now. You're not worried about unemployment. You've heard stories and may even have a hazy recollection of the big depression when 16 million were unemployed, standing on street corners with apples to sell or in bread lines or soup lines, or searching garbage cans for food scraps for themselves and their 32 million dependents—48 million in all—a third of our then population destitute. You may think that can't happen again.

A prominent Republican senator recently told me that to stop military spending would bring the worst financial crash this country ever saw. That military spending means bankruptcy if continued much longer, so we're in for a bust either way. Bankruptcy and unemployment if we continue military spending, a crash and unemployment if we stop it.

Right now, unemployment is increasing. Recently, Director Goodwin, of the United States Employment Security Bureau, asked Congress for \$13,600,000 in addition to what was estimated and already provided for the unemployment claim load for 1933. Layoffs and reduced work weeks have begun in textiles and shoe making areas and are spreading to television, refrigerators and appliances. In some areas unemployment is up to 6% and will probably reach 20%, Director Goodwin says.

WAREHOUSES LOADED

Republican Congressman Busbey of Illinois, commenting on these facts, said that reports show warehouses are loaded with gas stoves, refriger-

ators, television sets and various appliances, notwithstanding the billions we are spending on defense, and, Congressman Busbey says, "What frightens me is what would happen to the economy of our country if, for some reason or other, we were successful in bringing about agreements whereby we could eliminate a lot of this defense spending."

So-called Free Enterprise is supported by war and can't exist without war. You'll have war and sacrifice your sons on foreign soil, or you'll have a crash with unemployment and starvation at home—and that's a pretty picture for you and your children.

How long will you stand for this mess? How long will you continue to vote for the Demo-Republicans who are pledged to keep the system which has nothing for you but sacrifice of your sons abroad or unemployment and starvation for you and them at home?

The power machine is another reason why you doers of useful work are ever facing increased unemployment. So long as that power machine is privately owned and operated only for private profit, it is a worker-displacing machine, not a labor-saving machine. I'll show you why.

A canning plant near Denver used to employ 70 workers in one department. The manager found one machine which would do all the work and cost no more than four week's payroll for those workers. He put in the machine and laid off 69 workers, keeping one to run the machine. Don't blame the manager. If he hadn't put in the machine and discharged 69 workers and saved their payroll for the company, he would have lost his job, because his job was to make profits for the company. Don't blame the company directors, who hired the manager. They were elected by the stockholders to run the company for the profit of the stockholders. Don't blame the stockholders. They put their money into the company to make profits.

Profits is the purpose of Free Enterprise business. Profits is the game you vote for every time you vote Demo-Republican. By that vote you make it your game, and you are poor sports if you blame the fellow who beats you at your own game. A New Deal in the same old game with a deck of marked cards stacked against you is useless. Why not vote for a new game with a clean, unstacked deck?

The unions have done and are doing a great job for labor. More power to them. But unions can't stop the operation of the law of gravity any more than they can stop the operation of the economic law, and under our Free Enterprise private profit economy the power machine will always be a worker-displacing machine instead of a labor-saving machine—a curse instead of a blessing—and neither unions nor any other organization can stop that except by taking the power machine into socialized ownership and operating it for the benefit of all the people instead of for private profit. Then and then only will modern productive machinery be used to produce an abundance and reduce working hours instead of creating unemployment.

Just a few more examples of how the power machine is displacing workers, creating unemployment, reducing the workers' share of the product and increasing the profits of the owners.

In the steel industry the four high rolling mills with 125 men produced more sheet steel than 4,000 men could produce with the old methods. More steel—more idle steel workers. It used to take 9,000 men to make a half million light bulbs in a day. One machine now does it. More unemployed, more profits for the owner of the machine and so on throughout industry.

So long as deficit spending for war and preparation for war continues, and so long as our sons and daughters are taken out of useful, productive

employment and put into the business of destruction—which is war—we don't notice worker displacement by the power machine, but we will notice it when this military spending spree is stopped or even slowed down. Worker displacement will be inevitable and neither unions nor anything else can prevent it under the profit system.

We CAN prevent it by taking the business and machinery of production and distribution into our own hands and operating it for producing an abundance for the use of all, under democratically elected managers chosen in part by the workers and in part by the consumers. Then the power machine will be used to produce enough to satisfy all our needs and desires and, when those are satisfied, the machine will reduce the hours of labor for all and give us time to really live instead of spending our lives in getting a living.

Workers: Your right is the whole value of what you produce with your labor. Your objective should be to bring in that good government and industrial system which will assure everyone an opportunity to perform useful work and to receive the full value thereof.

Your power? Well, if you workers will unite for the objective of the kind of government which Lincoln said would be a good government, you and those who would join you in such a cause could capture the political and economic field and bring in a new day of peace, freedom and abundance, not simply for yourselves but for all.

The two old parties are sworn enemies of Lincoln's kind of a government. We Socialists are for that kind of government. If that is the kind of a government you would like, then say so by going to the polls and voting Socialist. It's the only way to make your vote really count. A Demo-Republican vote is thrown away.

Cast your fears aside and vote your convictions. Tell the world you are through with the Demo-Republican mess. Vote Socialist.

Darlington Hoopes

(Continued from Page 2)

power is concentrated into the hands of so few people.

The Labor Government in Great Britain met this problem by taking over the banks, transportation, coal, and the steel industries, and establishing a vast public health service to serve the needs of the people from the cradle to the grave. Although they lost control of Parliament in the elections last year they received a majority of the popular vote, and the results of the recent municipal elections indicate that the people are now ready to put them back into power again at the first opportunity.

Monopoly capitalism has developed to the point, particularly in the United States, where it is directly opposed to the public welfare. Unless we face that fact, and do the only intelligent thing, which is to take over the monopoly industries, and operate them collectively for the use and benefit of all the people, we are going to have industrial chaos, war, and Fascism.

Socialists favor democratic socialization by duly authorized legislative action with proper compensation to the owners. They propose in this manner to take over the monopoly industries, and to operate them democratically through boards upon which the workers, the working management and the consuming public will all be represented. In this way we can extend democracy to the economic field, save our political liberties, and prevent the private monopolies from robbing the public.

Vote Socialist on November 4!

Are The Soviet Workers Still Socialist?

(Following, in abridged form, is a statement prepared by a leading group of Russian Social Democrats and Social Revolutionaries in exile, which is particularly timely in view of Premier Stalin's recent declaration that it would be some time before "socialism" would be achieved in the Soviet Union).

Since the consolidation of the Communist dictatorship in Russia and the wide development of international totalitarian Communism under its leadership, no Socialist party anywhere can formulate its program and shape its policy without taking into account the deep ideological, political and moral crisis into which the Labor movement has been plunged since November 1917.

The democratic Socialists of Russia will find it even less possible—if and when their country is liberated—simply to return to the pre-November era. In a country which has been subjected for over three decades to the experience of Bolshevik "Socialism," the position of true democratic Socialism will indeed be a difficult and delicate one.

All those who have arrived from beyond the Iron Curtain during and since the war agree that vast sections of the population of the Soviet Union bitterly hate everything connected with "Socialism" of the Stalin brand.

But these new refugees also state that the Soviet masses, on the other hand, are strongly opposed not only to those whom they suspect of aiming at a restoration of the pre-revolutionary regime, but also to those who would be likely to propose, for example, handing over the country's heavy industry, mines or the transportation system to private owners, domestic or foreign.

It is no accident that the program of all the political groups formed within the new emigration are based, without a single exception, on the rejection of "exploitation of man by man" and on the recognition of the need to retain in the hands of the people the gigantic industry and all that has been built with the sweat and blood of that people in the course of the Five-Year Plans.

STILL A SOCIALIST

Repelled as he is by all that the Stalin regime attempted to pass as "Socialism" and "Marxism," the Soviet citizen is at the same time a Socialist, in the sense in which that term, without quotation marks, is understood in Western Europe. He is hungry for political freedom, but he is also in favor of a planned and predominantly socialized economy.

He wants a comprehensive system of social security, the guarantee of employment with unemployment insurance if he should find himself temporarily out of work. State and municipal health services, aid to children and the aged, free schooling and access to higher education. And he is strongly against any system of human exploitation.

In other words, he stands for a set of social, political, national and human rights, which are usually included in the program of Labor and Socialist parties and which, incidentally, the Soviet constitution promises but does not give the citizens of the Union.

The Soviet citizen will need a great deal of

time to understand and to believe that the measures he himself wants to be put into practice in post-Bolshevik Russia actually represent Socialism—true Socialism, so profoundly different in principle and in practice from the hateful Stalinism which for so many years has been presented to him as Socialism.

Whatever the way in which the Bolshevik era of Russian—and world—history comes to an end it is clear that post-Bolshevik Russia will be a country with a large industry and a population comprising many millions of workers, technicians, white-collar workers and farmers.

As soon as some form of political democracy has been established in the country and Stalin's fictitious "classless society" has gone up in smoke, all these millions will need a political party to defend their interests, express their desires and hopes, and formulate their demands.

As shown by the experience of Italy, after twenty-two years of Fascism, and of Germany, after twelve years of Hitlerism, the collapse of dictatorship is immediately followed by a resurgence of the Socialist movement. In the Russia of tomorrow, freed from dictatorship, the party of democratic Socialism is bound to play an important part.

The history of Russian Socialism, from its earliest beginnings, has been a history not only of rapid growth but also of constant division and breaking up. The basic parting at the start was between "Populism" and "Marxism." The latter gave rise in 1898 to the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party (RSDLP), and the former, two years later, to the Social Revolutionary Party.

Since their foundation and up to the present day, these two parties, actually closely related, have led entirely separate existences. Both parties had a well-defined Weltanschauung (conception of the world); one was Marxist, along the lines of the Grupa Osvebozhdenia Truda (Group for the Liberation of Labor), the other Populist and inspired by the tradition of Narodnaya Volia (The People's Will).

Though both were strongly influenced by the Western European Socialist parties of their time, the RSDLP stood for orthodox materialist Marxism, while the Social Revolutionary theorists rejected the philosophy of materialism and followed the political line of the "Revisionists"—Bernstein, David, Jaures and Vandervelde.

THE MASS OF PEASANTRY

A number of historical reasons account for the existence of two separate Socialist parties in pre-revolutionary Russia. The fundamental reason was that in Russia there were still vast masses of peasants of the pre-capitalist era, forming first a potentially and later an actually revolutionary force, while in Western Europe the peasant class had had its revolution much earlier: in 1789 in France, in 1848 in other countries.

At the birth of the Socialist movement in Russia, one issue which divided the Socialists was that of the "course of development"—a question which did not even arise in other countries. Would Russia follow the same pattern of bourgeois-capitalist development as other European countries, or would it be possible to avoid going through this phase, because of the specific tradi-

tions of the Russian peasantry?

Other points at issue were the respective parts to be played by the peasants and the workers in the revolutionary movement and in the realization of the Socialist ideal, the role of the individual, the meaning of the class struggle in history, and other doctrinal or tactical questions.

History has swept aside all these issues, which for so long a time had divided the Socialists of Russia into different groups and factions.

At the Second Congress of the RSDLP in 1903, the Marxist branch of Russian Socialism itself began to break up, and the two factions which emerged eventually became deadly enemies: Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Fundamentally the split was between the two parties, one standing for dictatorial, anti-democratic, Jacobin "Socialism" and aiming at the establishment in Russia of the dictatorship of a single class—actually of a single party—while the other, advocating democratic, evolutionary Socialism, recognized the need for revolutionary violence only in the struggle to overthrow autocracy or other forms of despotism and to establish a regime of political freedom.

This controversy within the Socialist movements—between those favoring dictatorship and those who believed in democracy—has also been settled by history. The victory of the revolutionary-dictatorial minority in a backward country, and its frenzied efforts to enforce acceptance of its despotic and pseudo-Socialistic system of slavery by sheer coercion and by terrorism upon all classes, including the workers, has led to the downfall of the revolution and has utterly discredited the very idea of Socialism in the eyes of millions of men. In the Soviet Union, a third of a century of Bolshevism, hailed by many as the triumph of true Socialism, has in fact reduced the people to a state of permanent malnutrition and general poverty; it has brought about human and political degradation and the enslavement of millions to a degree never known in modern history. To the rest of the world Bolshevism has brought not liberation but the death of millions, and holds out for the future only the horrible threat of a new world catastrophe of hardly imaginable scope.

Today there can no longer be any doubt that "Socialism" without freedom represents the worst form of slavery and inhuman barbarity. The old discussion of the relations between Socialism and democracy has now become meaningless. Democracy for us is an inseparable part of Socialism—it is part of the very definition of Socialism. Or, as Vandervelde put it: "Socialism will either be the Socialism of free men or it will not be at all."

Today it is the common task of all those who remain true to the cause of democratic Socialism to lay the groundwork for the creation of such a party.

Raphael Abramovitch, Vera Alexandrovna, Paul Berlin, Victor Chernov, George Denicke, Dr. J. James, Mark Khinoy, Boris Nicolaevsky, David Shub, Solomon Schwarz, Mark Vishniak, Simon Volin, Nicolas Yurevsky and Vladimir Zenzinov.

On The Lookout

By KENNETH ROGERS

"middle group," or those with incomes from \$2,890 to \$5,160, were slightly better off in 1951 than in 1949, after taking into account changes in taxes and prices.

The Foreman's Association of America is launching a drive to

increase its membership. Down to about a third of its one-time 50,000 members, the FAA has mapped out plans to organize thousands of new members.

Another business attempt to spread propaganda in the schools has been revealed. Fred C.

Clark, Chairman of the American Economic Foundation, is asking several corporations to contribute money to his "educational program" for the schools. A House Committee investigating such corporations as Philadelphia Electric, Socony-Vacuum and

Shell and Gulf Oil as among the contributors to the AEF. Clark has formerly been identified with the Crusaders and the Liberty League.

The International Typographic Union has launched the "Labor Daily" in America. An eight page tabloid newspaper, it is the country's only labor daily. The paper, now being circulated in West Virginia, may become national in scope.

The Federal Reserve Board has released figures on consumer finances which disprove the myth that everyone in America is well off. For example, about 10.7 million families owe doctors, dentists or hospitals an average of \$166 dollars each. Only 3.71 million families own any stock at all, and of this number, the 539,000 families that own more than \$10,000 each in stock hold at least two-thirds of the total outstanding. Only half of the 28.5 million families classified as the

The SOCIALIST CALL

ROBIN MYERS, Editor

Associate Editors

AARON LEVENSTEIN

NORMAN THOMAS

HERMAN SINGER

Contributing Editors: Lewis Corey, Erich Fromm, Patrick Gorman, Donald Harrington, Harry W. Laidler

THE SOCIALIST CALL, official organ of the Socialist Party, is published bi-weekly by the Call Association, Inc., a non-profit foundation dedicated to the creation of a cooperative commonwealth, at 303 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N.Y. Telephone: GRamercy 3-4286

Signed articles do not necessarily represent the opinion of THE SOCIALIST CALL or of the Call Association, Inc.

Re-entered as second class matter December 13, 1949, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 13, 1879. Subscription \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for five months; \$3.00 for two years.

401

Readers Write

Sinclair On Stalin

(Upton Sinclair has asked the SOCIALIST CALL to publish the following letter, particularly since it may serve as a reply to questions he has received from American liberals and socialists.)

Mr. Gordon Schaffer:

You addressed an open letter to me which was published in "Forward" on September 13th last. The editor very kindly sent me a copy by airmail, but I have had to delay a whole month before replying for the reason that I was preparing another "Lanny Budd" book for the press.

The problem which we are debating will last a long time I fear, so my answer is still timely. You criticized my "Open Letter to Stalin" and your concluding sentence is, "Your letter is not from a Socialist critic. Upton Sinclair at seventy-two is denying the Upton Sinclair I remember and honor."

It is a small detail that I became seventy-four one week after your letter was published. But age has made no difference in my thinking and I am not in the least "tired of the struggle," as you venture to guess.

Thirty-three years have passed since I wrote "The Brass Check" and it is not surprising that you, Mr. Schaffer, should have forgotten what you read in it. If you will turn to the beginning of Chapter Sixty, entitled "The Case of Russia," you will read the following words:

"Let me make clear at the outset my point of view, oft repeated. I am not a Bolshevik, and have never been a Bolshevik." The paragraph then goes on to give a precise and correct definition of what a Bolshevik believes, and I state "I don't believe that it will be necessary for the workers to seize guns and turn the politicians out of office; I believe that they can elect their own politicians, and force even capitalist legislatures to pass laws recognizing union control of industry. I am well aware that this method will be slower, but I believe it will be quicker in the long run, because it will avoid the waste incidental to civil war, and the possibilities of failure and temporary reaction."

In other words, I was writing as a democratic Socialist, and that has always been my point of view. Thirty years ago I published a pamphlet, "Letters to Judd," of which some three hundred thousand were circulated

in America. That pamphlet contains an elaborate defense of the political process of achieving Socialism, and sets forth the possible wastefulness of the other method, that of violent overthrow of capitalist governments.

That political program is exactly what I have been advocating for exactly fifty years, and the British people have given a magnificent demonstration of the process. The Russians chose the process of violence and the result has been Stalinism, a thing of cruelty and terror the like of which has never been seen in this world.

That any free Briton should defend it passes my comprehension. That he should expect me to defend it, and cite my early books as a reason, simply proves that he has read my books very carelessly.

You, sir, may be willing for Stalin to take your country and rule you, as he rules the Poles and the Czechs, and the North Koreans indirectly. But I surely don't want him to rule me. Because Scotland is free, you can plead Stalin's cause in it; but what would happen to you if you tried to plead the cause of free Scotland in Stalin's slave empire?

UPTON SINCLAIR
Corona, Calif.

Oppose McCarthy

To the Editor:

In your October 3 issue the lead story on McCarthy cited the Milwaukee Sentinel poll of clergymen which alleged 3-1 support for McCarthy and your writer stated this poll was probably accurate even though conducted by a biased Hearst paper. What evidence the writer has to substantiate this is not given.

However, for the record it should be stated that the West Wisconsin Conference of the Methodist Church adopted a resolution last June sharply condemning McCarthy. This resolution was passed 225-3.

The conference included lay leaders of churches as well as ministers. The Wisconsin Conference of the same church has also adopted a resolution on civil liberties opposing McCarthy's methods though not naming him. I do not know how the Lutheran or Catholic clergy of the state stand on McCarthy, but Methodist ministers are almost unanimous in opposition.

JOHN M. MCCARTNEY
Belmont, Wisc.

Books In Review

A Study Of American CO's In World War II

CONSCRIPTION OF CONSCIENCE. By Mulford Q. Sibley and Philip E. Jacob. Cornell University Press. 580 pp. \$5.00.

REVIEWED BY EVAN W. THOMAS

It is fortunate that conscientious objection to war in the U.S.A. during World War II was chosen by Robert E. Cushman to be one of the Cornell University Studies in Civil Liberty. Otherwise it is improbable that a record of similar thoroughness and objectivity would have been possible. In choosing Mulford Sibley and Philip Jacob to make the study, Professor Cushman assured a sympathetic as well as scholarly treatment of the subject.

Considering the great variety of conscientious objectors, the differences in local draft boards and the association of the peace churches with Selective Service in the administration of alternative service, it is no easy task to "tell the story and analyze the problem of conscientious objection in World War II" without omitting significant details or distorting facts.

The authors do neither. They have succeeded exceptionally well in giving a comprehensive account of the actual facts. Although their sympathies are obviously with the conscientious objectors, they do not omit from the record conduct that was regarded by many as discreditable to the objectors. They wisely refrain from the impossible task of attempting to analyze the diversity of motives behind conscientious objection, but they outline in general terms the varieties of religious faith and political philosophy on which objection to war was usually based. They have organized their material well and provided it with copious documentation. The book is a reliable source of factual information for all who are interested in the subject.

CHURCH ADMINISTRATION

Of necessity a large part of the book is devoted to the administration of alternative service for objectors by the churches. In dealing with this controversial subject they are scrupulously honest in presenting facts but they are more concerned with the impact of this innovation on the conscientious objectors than on civil liberty.

When the churches accepted the responsibility of administering Civilian Public Service for all men legally classified as conscientious objectors, an entirely new factor in American life was introduced. The fact that it involved a relatively small and unpopular minority does not lessen its significance for civil liberty.

From the point of view of civil liberty, it is much more important to decide whether the decision of the churches was right or wrong in principle than to note its immediate effect on conscientious objectors.

The former point would probably have received more thorough discussion had the authors not differed as to the wisdom of the churches' decision. Sibley approaches the problem from the point of view of civil liberty and believes that "the long-run interests of religious and civil liberty would have been better served had the churches refused to administer alternative service." Jacob, on the other hand,

believes, "the churches which financed and administered the program won a new and significant place for the religious-pacifist minority in American Society." Notwithstanding this difference of opinion, the authors have presented the facts of Civilian Public Service fully and impartially.

Entirely apart from the controversy over Civilian Public Service, the story of conscientious objection in World War II is far from a happy one. Frustrations were plentiful for the administrators of conscripted labor in and out of prison as well as for the objectors. Many objectors were sent to prison where the variety of religious faiths and political philosophies was even greater than in C.P.S. camps. The authors devote a chapter to the so-called absolutists in prison which covers the subject sympathetically, if not entirely adequately.

THE ABSOLUTIST LABEL

The absolutist label is a carry-over from conscientious objection in World War I. The authors, understandably, are somewhat vague as to its derivation. In World War I most objectors registered and were sent to army camps where they were kept as members of the army, in spite of their refusal to be inducted. In the course of time most of them were transferred to an army camp at Fort Riley, Kansas where the army personnel continued to try to persuade or force them to work.

To terminate this anomalous and intolerable situation for all concerned, a few objectors, including the writer of this review, undertook a hunger strike which ended when the army began to court martial the objectors and sentence them to an army prison where many objectors continued to refuse to work. They came to be called "absolutists." The group included men with a variety of beliefs and faiths.

Since the authors believe that this reviewer and others like him set the pattern for hunger strikes and other activities of "absolutists" in World War II, the attitude of the former to the absolutist label requires some explanation. In attempting this explanation, the writer speaks only for himself and others like him.

In World Wars I and II there were objectors like the writer who professed no religion in the conventional sense of the word and who were opposed to rendering any conscripted service under a draft enacted for the purposes of war. They were strongly opposed to all philo-

sophical and political absolutism. They were as much opposed to the absolutism of anarchy as to that of totalitarianism.

In general they believed in law and order imposed by the will of the majority. They were not opposed to all coercion or even to killing in certain circumstances but they believed that conscripted military service, including alternative service was the strongest link in the chain binding mankind to the perpetuation of wars.

In deciding where to draw the line in their refusal to work under compulsion, each individual was expected to follow his own conscience or inner sense of right. They were not concerned with the absurdities of arguments about absolute consistency. They knew that absolute consistency is a form of absolutism that not even the greatest saint or the most totalitarian government can achieve.

They were aware that even moral values are relative but they believed that decisions had to be made by means of these values which are the only genuine safeguard of civil liberty, constituting an essential background for any Bill of Rights.

REFUSING SERVICE

Thus, in refusing compulsory service under a military conscription law, this type of objector was resisting not all law but a particular law which he regarded as morally wrong and opposed to the well being of society as well as of himself.

Except by the example of his conduct, he made no effort to coerce or to persuade others to act as he did. The hunger strike was used as a means of bringing specific injustices or wrongs to the attention of others very much as Gandhi used it, although in World War I few, if any, of the objectors had heard of Gandhi.

Such objectors must be, and usually are, prepared to take the consequences of their action. However, from the point of view of civil liberty they cannot be classified with ordinary criminals. To place them in prisons designed for the latter is certain to create friction and unnecessary trouble.

A saner and more practical way of dealing with the problem, when exemption is refused by law, is to confine them in a special camp and let them take care of themselves. After many trials and tribulations for all concerned this was finally done in World War I. The government would have been more humane had it followed this procedure in World War II.

Elections And Europe

By HERMAN SINGER

In the current issue of Plebs, the publication of the National Council of Labor Colleges in Britain, a visiting American undertakes to explain why there is no labor party in America. This is a question which has aroused interest on this side of the Atlantic, too, but whereas Americans can list a long series of historical reasons, to European workers such analysis simply adds to their puzzlement. This can be judged by the appearance in British labor and socialist periodicals of letters inquiring why it is not possible for the British labor movement to make contact with the "America of Eugene Debs."

While a good deal of the erratic functioning of the American political system must remain a mystery to outsiders on simple geographical terms—U.S. politics must be experienced on the spot before immunity can set in—there are probably other factors which contribute toward the kind of despair voiced by British workers, and which make them hanker for the days when the voice of Debs was heard clearly across the land.

Part of the story, of course, lies in the fact that, in Debs' day, it was possible to describe the industrial situation as one in which boss faced worker in harsh and unrelenting struggle. Debs' indictment of the iniquities of unrestrained capitalism was expressed in terms easily grasped in class-divided England.

While a considerable change has taken place in the forms of that struggle since the organization of the mass industries, with a shift of emphasis to the political sphere, there are aspects of American policy which are so confusing, contradictory and reactionary that European workers are understandably dismayed. The dismay arises primarily out of those areas of foreign policy in which the military has been prominent.

The pressure for a stepped-up arms economy throughout Western Europe without adequate provision for sharing raw materials, the insistence on rearming Germany without provision for preventing a comeback of German militarists, the haste in rushing to obtain bases in Franco Spain, the automatic response of bipartisan fealty to Chiang Kai-shek—these, along with the piddling contributions toward the launching of the Point Four program, constitute the basic criticism of the recent conduct of American foreign policy in the eyes of Europe's workers.

These phases of American foreign policy are highlighted by actions which, because they are simpler to understand, emphasize in their own way that the vaunted American regard for civil liberties can be breached in surprising ways. It is difficult to think of a bureaucratic action more likely to alienate allies throughout the world than the announcement by the Department of Justice that Charles Chaplin, the famous comedian, would be challenged on his right to re-enter the country, apparently on the ground that he had, on a number of occasions in the past, permitted his name to be used by Communist Party fronts. What makes this action particularly ludicrous is the sight of a U.S. agency, in all its juridical majesty, awaiting an opportunity to set its trap after the comedian had left the country.

Of a piece with this move was the recall, for questioning in the U.S., of Paul R. Porter, a Mutual Security Agency official in Paris. Despite the fact that Porter had been a well-known and active member of the Socialist Party until 1941, and had been an earnest opponent of Stalinism for many years, Senator Homer Ferguson, a member of the Senate's "watchdog" subcommittee on MSA, had apparently been fed a quotation made nearly twenty years ago which convinced the Senator that Porter was "advocating revolution—by violence if necessary."

These two moves, whatever their final outcome, have already achieved maximum damage. Chaplin, regarded with admiration throughout the world, is under official attack in his adopted land. And Porter is summoned home to explain his horrendous past as a Socialist from service in a number of countries of Western Europe where Socialist Parties are in the forefront of the fight against Stalinism.

Confronted with such moves, British workers longing for signs of the existence of "another America" express more than mere nostalgia. One of the means of indicating such solidarity with workers overseas may lie in a substantial Socialist vote in the American election of 1952.

German Socialists Expose American Sponsorship Of Nazi-Type Guerrillas

By GABRIEL GERSH

(Gabriel Gersh is a frequent contributor to the SOCIALIST CALL.)

Over the past few years, the German Social Democrats have been critical of American policy as tending to encourage dangerous, reactionary elements and thus to build up the conditions for a Nazi comeback. Recently a scandal in Western Germany confirmed the German Socialists' indictment of American policy.

August Zinn, the Socialist Minister President of Hesse, revealed that the United States had organized, trained and armed a German sabotage organization which would go into action if the Russians overran Western Germany. On U.S. orders, this organization, known as the Bund Deutscher Jugend (League of German Youth), established "Technical service," headed by Gerhard Peters of Frankfurt. In the event of war with Russia, this technical service, which has between 1,000 and 2,000 members, had the task of conducting guerrilla operations in the Soviet-occupied areas. Its members were to destroy bridges, supply depots, railway lines and troop installations.

Periodically, the BDJ units went to a secret camp in Odenwald forest, where they were trained in the use of infantry weapons, grenades and knives. The 100 "elite" youth involved were all former German officers of the Air Force, the Army and the Nazi S.S. units, ranging in age from 30 to 50. Confiscated documents revealed that the U.S. sponsored partisans received 50,000 (\$11,900) a month for their operations.

What's more, the technical service compiled a list of undesirable characters "to be put out of action" when the Russians struck. The list included not only Communists, but also 81 prominent Social Democrats. The

intended Socialist victims of the BDJ were Erich Ollenhauer, Socialist party leader, Heinrich Zinnkann, Hessian Interior Minister, Ludwig Metzger, Cultural Minister, Max Brauer, Mayor of Hamburg, Wilhelm Kaisen, Mayor of Bremen and several Bundestag leaders, including the only Jewish deputy.

CHARGE NOT DENIED

The U.S. High Commissioners Office denied that American officers were involved in the activities of the organization but did not deny the German Socialists' main charges. After the Communists invaded South Korea, there was anxiety in U.S. military circles that the Communists might attempt a similar move into Western Germany. Although the U.S. organized and trained the BDJ as a potential partisan group, it was apparently not disturbed by the Nazi caste which controlled the organization.

The BDJ was also financed by the German government. It received from the Federal government a grant of 10,000 marks towards the cost of organizing a youth rally at Frankfurt at Whitsum. The Adenauer government considers the BDJ as West Germany's equivalent of the Eastern Zone's 2,000,000 strong Communist Freie Deutsche Jugend.

Even before the BDJ's "partisan activities" were exposed, many Germans believed that the organization had the makings of another Hitler Youth Order. This fact can be gathered from the following extracts of a speech made by one of its leaders and smuggled out of a secret meeting:

"They are false Christians who say that Christians must not kill . . . We'll reconquer Breslau and Königsberg . . . We are against any kind of planned economy . . . Denazification was the biggest crime and swindle ever against the German people. The U.S. is our guarantee of victory, the Americans are the Romans of our century. We don't want to haggle over defense like Schumacher, for we are receiving the unreserved support of the USA, and we shall go on fighting to vindicate the honor of the Waffen S.S."

The German Socialists may be expected to capitalize on this affair as a means of strengthening their opposition to the rearming of Germany. The Socialists will justifiably claim that is proven that the U.S. is encouraging the most reactionary groups and that, in its haste to find anti-communist allies, it is rearming the wrong Germans.

Two Varieties Of Justice

The scales of justice do some peculiar weighing, as illustrated by two news items. One says two Washington men, who stole corn "valued at \$2," were sentenced to a year in prison.

These men may be unsavory characters unworthy of sympathy, but compare their crime and punishment with those of former Congressman Andrew J. May of Kentucky, and Henry Garsson. Their cases are recalled by the other news item, which is about charges that Garsson dodged income taxes.

Garsson and May, who held the high position of chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee during the Second World War, were convicted of conspiracy to defraud the government on war contracts. WHAT HAPPENED TO THEM?

They were sentenced to "eight months to two years" in prison, and May was "paroled" before finishing his term.

In short, "justice" deals out approximately equal punishment to a congressman and businessman who defrauded their country in wartime, and to men who stole \$2 worth of corn.

(LABOR)

CHARLES CHAPLIN
in his human drama
Limelight
starring **CLAIRE BLOOM**
• Sydney Chaplin
Produced, written and directed by Charles Chaplin
Released thru United Artists
ASTOR TRANS-LUX
60th St. Madison
All Seats Reserved
Matinee 2:30
Evening 8:40
Phone PL 3-3748

"A novel and unusual cinema adventure!"
—Frank Quinn, Daily Mirror
Ray Milland
The THIEF
with Martin Gabel and Rita Gam
A Harry M. Popkin Production • Released thru United Artists
Great ROXY Stage
JOHNNY JOHNSTON
Anthony, Allyn & Hodges
Extra! **JERRY COLONNA**
On the ICE STAGE
ARNOLD SHODA
Roxy Skating Belles & Blades and all-new revue
The World Famous
DOORS OPEN 10:30 A.M.
Roxy 50c
Children Under 12 At All Times
7th Ave. & 50th St., NYC
Feature At: 11 a.m., 2:10, 5, 8, 11 p.m. • Late Stage Show 10 p.m.

As I See It —

Thomas Condemns Use Of Anti-Socialist Ad In N.Y. Times

Editor, N.Y. Times:

In your issue of October 15th, you carry a full page advertisement headed "Socialism? Brother, You Don't Know the Half of It." It appears that this expensive advertisement is a reprint of what has already been published nationally by the Standard Steel Spring Co., of Corapolis, Pa.

The advertisement is an inaccurate and biased discussion of something it calls socialism, which it alleges is an effort to obtain "political management of the total lives of the people." This is a false statement concerning socialism as distinct from communism. And the illustrations taken from the recent history of Great Britain are grossly unfair.

Wage levels in Britain were settled under capitalism at levels far below American wages, and in terms of general well being, the Labor Government was very successful in improving the lot of wage earners in Britain.

However, I do not write primarily to discuss the truth of the advertisement, but to call your attention to the fact that its present appearance is a thinly disguised form of political advertising in behalf of the Republican Party as against not only the small Socialist Party but the Democrats. Taft and his candidate Eisenhower have both taken the line that what the Democrats have done and will do is a form of "creeping socialism."

A corporation could not insert a frankly partisan advertisement at the expense of its stockholders. It can insert this kind of advertisement, and in all probability deduct its cost before computing its income tax, thereby charging around two-thirds of its cost to the rest of us taxpayers.

This is a process against which I strongly protest. It is complete evasion of the spirit of the election laws. It is an attempt to make the public pay most of the cost of its own indoctrination. I should object even if the advertisement were not of itself so gross a distortion of the facts.

I have written a formal complaint on the tax matter to the income tax bureau.

NORMAN THOMAS,
Chairman Public Affairs
Socialist Party

Free Enterprise Case History

The Dollar Line Ships Out With \$30 Million In U.S. Money

The papers which are moaning over the "terrible" state of affairs in Washington don't seem worried about the "Dollar Line" case. They think it's perfectly all right to get away with millions of public money—if it is done by Big Business.

Back in 1938, the big Dollar Steamship Line was "broke" and owed \$7.5 million to the U.S. Maritime Commission. To pay that debt to Uncle Sam, the line turned over to the commission 92 per cent of its stock.

During and after the Second World War, the line enjoyed plenty of shipping business, mostly at the expense of American taxpayers. In addition, the taxpayers' pockets were tapped for large government subsidies paid to the line, which was renamed the American President Lines and run by Uncle Sam as 92 per cent "owner" of the stock.

As a result of all this, the line "came out of the red ink" and became worth many millions. That money looked good to the "Dollar interests," headed by R. Stanley Dollar, and in 1945 they demanded back their stock. They said they had not turned it over permanently to Uncle Sam, but had merely "hocked" it with the Maritime Commission until the \$7.5 million debt was paid off out of profit.

The commission, which was so inefficient and "smelly" that it later had to be abolished, apparently did a poor job of drawing up the legal papers when it took over the Dollar Line stock. Last year, a Federal court at Washington ordered the government to hand the stock back to the Dollar interests.

JUDGE SCOLDED TRUMAN

President Truman didn't like that decision and Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, whose Commerce Department had jurisdiction over the Maritime Commission, took the case to another Federal court, in California. Then something extraordinary happened.

The judges of the court at Washington — including former

Senator from Missouri Bennett Champ Clark, who was "best man" at Truman's wedding years ago—threatened to take dire action against Truman and Sawyer for "contempt of court."

Later, in June this year, Sawyer "settled" the dispute by signing an agreement under which the Dollar interests are to get back half of the 92 per cent stock. As the same private interests also own some of the remaining 8 per cent stock, they will control the valuable ship line, with Uncle Sam sitting in the back seat as a "minority stockholder."

The agreement contains a further provision which, the Securities and Exchange Commission announced this week, is now being put into effect. Under the agreement, the 92 per cent stock, owned "50-50" by the Dollar in-

terests and Uncle Sam, was put into the hands of the Riggs National Bank, at Washington, as "temporary trustee."

Now the bank is to sell the stock to anyone who will "bid" at least \$14 million for it. The Dollar interests are expected to offer about the \$14 million and be the successful bidder.

If that happens, the Dollar interests will then hand Uncle Sam \$7 million for his half of the stock, keep the other \$7 million they paid for their half, and thus get all of the 92 per cent stock at a "net cost" of only \$7 million.

This stock today has a "book value" of \$30 million and the line is estimated to be worth as much as \$70 million. Thus the Dollar interests will get at least \$30 million for the bargain price of \$7 million.

For The Rich Only — How To Avoid Taxes

Everyone knows Congress put into the tax laws a lot of "loopholes" favoring the rich. To realize how that law leaks like a sieve, however, it is necessary to read business publications and the advice of "tax experts." They are always pointing out more and more loopholes. For example:

In a letter to prospective "clients," one expert says: "By making a member of your family a creditor, you can reduce your taxable income. One company head made his wife an \$8,500 creditor, and so far has apportioned to her \$6,900 one year, \$7,700 the next, and \$10,300 the next—all of which he has tax-deducted."

Among other things, the same expert points out how businessmen, through tax deductions, can make Uncle Sam pay for "club dues" and "luncheons," which "means a nice tax saving." Also how, "under the new tax law," it is possible for a rich man to "contribute to the support of a relative and get a brand new

tax saving far greater than the total contribution."

A business news item says the U. S. Steel Corporation made a very gratifying profit "with help of a retroactive \$41 million Federal tax credit which more than counter-balanced the retroactive wage costs resulting from the new agreement with the steel-workers' union."

Ordinary people, of course, know little or nothing about "retroactive tax credits," "making a member of your family a creditor," making Uncle Sam pay for "club dues and luncheons," "saving in taxes 'far more' than the money contributed in support of a relative, or 'stock options.'" Ordinary people are not in a position to take advantage of these and the hundreds of other tax loopholes.

But the "Rich Men's Lobby" has experts to think up loopholes, put them "quietly" into tax laws and to advise wealthy men and corporations how to take full advantage of these schemes.

Attention! All California Voters!

The California election laws provide a place on the ballot to write in the names of the Socialist candidates for president and vice-president. The following diagram is a sample ballot showing how to write in the names for the November election.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS	
Vote for one party	
Dwight D. Eisenhower, for President	Republican
Richard M. Nixon, for Vice President	
Vincent Hallinan, for President	Independent
Charlotta A. Bass, for Vice President	Progressive
Stuart Hamblen, for President	Prohibition
E. A. Holtwick, for Vice President	
Adlai E. Stevenson, for President	Democratic
John J. Sparkman, for Vice President	
Darlington Hoopes, for President	Socialist
Samuel Friedman, for Vice President	

- Write In Names of Socialist Candidates. (As indicated above)
- Write In Name Socialist.
- Mark A Cross Only With Rubber Stamp.

"KEEP MOVIN'!"



Vote For These Presidential Candidates Of The Socialist Party

COLORADO

For U.S. Congress, First Congressional District—
Carle Whitehead
For State Senate (First Senatorial District, Denver):
Selig Goodman
Henry Neumann
William F. Reynard
For State Senate (22d Senatorial District, Arapahoe and Elbert Counties): Frederick D. Gaspard
For State Representative (First Legislative District, Denver):
Charles R. Axelson
Annie Belle Harrison

CONNECTICUT

United States Senator—
Jasper McLevy
William Howard Taft

DELAWARE

State Legislators from New Castle County:
First Representative District, Miles Barber
Second Representative District, LeRoy B. Jones
Fourth Representative District, Annie E. Whiskman
Fifth Representative District, Pehr Lundberg
Second Senatorial District, Charles W. Perry

MISSOURI

United States Senator Joseph G. Hodges
Governor Maurice R. Wheeler
Lieutenant-Governor E. F. Moore
State Treasurer Elizabeth Erbe

NEW YORK

United States Senator Joseph G. Glass

PENNSYLVANIA

U.S. Senator William J. Van Essen
State Treasurer Hans Peters
Auditor General Walter R. Hollinger
Congressman Darlington Hoopes
State Senator Mark L. Brown
General Assembly—1st District:
Elwood R. Keppley
William Prutzman
General Assembly—2nd District:
Amos N. Leshner
General Assembly—3rd District:
Robert G. Aulenbach
General Assembly—4th District:
Clarence B. Prutzman, Jr.

VIRGINIA

U.S. Senator Clark Robb

WISCONSIN

Governor Fred Dahir

Darlington Hoopes

Socialist Candidate for President

Darlington Hoopes, Socialist candidate for President of the United States, has in his own person, and in his own activities, attempted to put into practice some of the principles of the socialism he advocates. In addition to his extensive activities on behalf of the Socialist Party, which he joined in 1914, Darlington Hoopes has been active in the cooperative movement, has fought for equality for minority groups, and has served in his own community as a member of the Board of Directors of the Reading (Pennsylvania) Y.W.C.A., and has worked with the Boy Scouts in Reading. He is a member of the American Federation of Teachers.

Hoopes, who has run for office frequently on the Socialist Party ticket, was elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives on three occasions, from 1930 to 1934, and was cited by reporters covering the sessions as the most useful member of the state legislature. He served as City Solicitor of Reading from 1936 to 1940.

Born in Harford County, Maryland, September 11, 1896, Hoopes attended the George School in Norristown, Pa., and the University of Wisconsin, where he joined the Socialist Party. He studied law in an office in Norristown and has practiced this profession since 1921, first in Norristown and later at Reading, where he has been a leading member of the Socialist Party, which has regularly elected Socialist mayors.

In addition to serving on the National Executive Committee and as National Chairman of the Socialist Party, Hoopes was candidate for vice-president on the Socialist Party ticket in 1944, and ran for Congress in Pennsylvania's Thirteenth District in 1950.

He was instrumental in organizing, and has served as chairman, of the Reading Community Race Relations Council, and has been on the Executive Committee of the State Council for a Pennsylvania F.E.P.C. since 1948. He has also been on the Board of Directors of the Eastern Co-operatives, Inc.

His hobbies are tennis, handball, and gardening.

Samuel H. Friedman

Socialist Candidate for Vice-President

Samuel H. Friedman, 55, Socialist candidate for vice-president, has conducted a one-man crusade for the ideals of socialism for more than thirty-five years. Beginning with his temporary suspension from City College in 1917 for writing "pacifistic editorials" as editor of the college weekly, Friedman has been forthright in fighting every form of reaction ever since.

He has been a frequent candidate for office on the Socialist Party ticket in New York, and is considered one of the most effective Socialist orators, whether on street corners or in formal debate. Now a vice-president of the Community and Social Agency Employees Union, Local 1707, CIO, and its delegate to the CIO City Council, Friedman has a long record of support for workers' rights. This phase of his activity has brought him into frequent conflict with the police in strike situations, and with the Communists, who have been the targets of his attacks on totalitarian tactics.

Friedman has helped organize clothing and textile workers in New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and North Carolina. He was an early member of the American Newspaper Guild (CIO), in whose organization he was active along with its founder, Heywood Broun. He also holds membership in the American Federation of Teachers, A.F.L.

He has a master's degree from Columbia University and is a professional newspaper man, having edited the SOCIALIST CALL as well as various labor and trade papers, and having served as publicity man for trade unions and non-profit organizations. He is editor of "Rebel Song Book," recognized as one of the most comprehensive collections of labor and Socialist songs in English.

A member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, he has been its candidate for Alderman, Assemblyman, State Senator, Congressman, City Controller, President of the City Council, and Lieutenant Governor of New York State.

Friedman is recognized as one of New York City's most enthusiastic aerophiles.

CAMPAIGN WIND-UP

Have Your Own Wind-Up Affair
SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1952

SAMUEL H. FRIEDMAN, Vice Presidential candidate of the Socialist Party on TV — Columbia Broadcasting System feature: Where Do You Stand? Two newspaper men will interview the candidate. The program originates in Washington, D.C., 4:30-5 p.m., eastern standard time, on Sunday, November 2. It will be carried over a national hook-up.

Sidney Vyorst - Agent

Affiliated Co-op League U.S.A.

Farm Bureau Mutual Auto Ins. Co.
Farm Bureau Mutual Fire Ins. Co.
Farm Bureau Life Insurance Co.

UP TO 20% RATE REDUCTION
ON AUTO INSURANCE

SAVINGS & SERVICE ON
ALL INSURANCE

795 Broadway • New York 3, N.Y.
SPring 7-5770

5th GENERATION OF TRADITION,
INTEGRITY AND CHARACTER

J. J. MARKS

Jewelry, Watch & Clock
Repairing, Sales & Service

22 West 48th Street
New York 19, N.Y.
PL 7-1333

(Bring this ad for special consideration and discount to readers of THE CALL. Mail orders solicited.)

See and Hear — In Person

The Socialist Presidential Candidates

DARLINGTON HOOPES
Socialist Candidate for President

SAMUEL H. FRIEDMAN
Socialist Candidate for Vice-President

JOSEPH G. GLASS
N.Y. Senatorial Candidate

NORMAN THOMAS

Rev. David Cory, chairman

at the

DEBS DAY DINNER, Friday, October 31, at 6 p.m.
at

FIFTH AVENUE HOTEL

Fifth Avenue and 9th Street, N.Y.C.

\$4.00 cover includes tip

For Reservations, Call GR 5-6621
(Talks Begin at 8 p.m.)